G. R. S. 58]

Previous references.

Mucz 365 & 09
S&I 1 & 12
301 of 12.

Later references.

2:1--11

1913
(Mucz)

File No.

Serial Nos.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 106

Part B for Dec 1913

SUBJECT. Modification of order No 2373 - Mucz 301-12-2 & 10-6-13. Reconstruction of Kamuka Parameswara Temple at Closepet by the Vaisyas.

(1) Letter No 593 & 2-2-14 from the D.C. Bangalore forwarding for favorable consideration petition from Subbaraya Setty & others of Vaisya Community for the reconsideration of the Govt. order re the subject matter on certain conditions

(2) Letter No 600 & 4 2/14 from D.C. Bangalore submitting plans produced by Vaisyas of Closepet with their petition addressed to them

(3) Petitions from Subbaraya Setty & others of Closepet & 10 2/14 & 14 2/14 respectively presented thro' their address

PTO

GPB—3,500—21-7-14

2961.

For Disposal at a Meeting.

No. C. 182

26.10.1914.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Council Matter.

SUBJECT.

Modification of the Government Order [illegible], dated the 10th June 1913, according sanction for the [illegible] of the Kannika Parameswari temple at Closepet, [illegible] tions.

CIRCULATED TO THE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.

By Order,

D M. Narasimha Rao,

26th.....October..1914.1914. Offg. *Secretary to Government.*

Extraordinary Member of Council. Draft approved by the Extraordinary Members 29/10. Dwarka

First Member of Council. Seen by the First Member. 29/10

Second Member of Council. Opinion recorded by the Second Member of Council.

GPB—1,000—28-8-14

G.R.S. 15]

Facing sheet for cases included in the schedule appended to Notification No 36 of the 8th Aug 1922

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

SUBJECT

Modification of the Govt. Order No.[illegible]-13-[illegible], dated the 10th June 1913, according permission to [illegible] Parameswari temple at Closepet, subject to [illegible]

	Date	Initial of officer himself or responsible Deputy
Received in the Secretariat		
Submitted to Secretary ...		
Submitted by Secretary to Dewan		
Do to Member in charge ...		
Returned to Secretary		
Circulated by Secretary for Council ...	26 6 14	
Forwarded by....2nd.....Member ..	6 6 14	
Forwarded by.... .....Member		
Forwarded by..... Member		
Received in Secretariat		
Considered in Council		
Submitted to the Dewan		
Submitted to His Highness		
Orders passed by His Highness		
Final Orders issued		
Circulated to the Members of Council ...		
Extraordinary Member		
First Member ..		
Second Member		
Returned to Secretary		

GPB—1,000—11-9-14

G.R.S. 117 1913.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Miscellaneous)

NOTES.

File No. 417-13.

FILE HEADING.

Construction of Kamacha Parameswari temple at Cuddapet by the Vaisyas

From

The Dy. Commissioner, Bangalore Distt.

No. 593 Dated 2-2-1914 Received

Diary No 1463.	Enclos 1 Petn & records	Spare Copies -	Serial No 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Forwards for favorable consideration petition from Subraya Setty and others praying for a re-consideration of the former order granting them permission to construct the above temple subject to certain conditions

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Sl. 2. From, the Dy Commr, Bangalore Distt,
Letter no 600 Dy 4-2-1914
Submits the plans of the proposed temple and site, produced by the Vaishyas of Cuddapet with their petition addressed to the Dy. Commr

NOTES—First Sheet.

GPB—35 000—15 6-12

G. R S 12]

2 2

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 417 of 1913.

Serial No.

384 From, Subraya Setty and Other Vaishyas, Petitions 10-2-1914 and 14-2-1914 (presented to the Dewan Through their Advocates)

Pray that the Govt orders relating to the construction of Kanakamma temple may be reviewed and permission granted to them to re-construct the temple facing east, and also to dispense with the putting up of a stone tablet inscribed with the purport of the stipulated conditions.

From file nos 365-09 and 301-12 are herewith submitted The office-notes in these collections go exhaustively into the facts of the case.

On a complaint from Yedur Setty and certain other Lingayets of Closepet that contrary to manual, the komatis were not be permitted to construct kanakamma temple in the ~~street~~ Petah, the Dy Commrs report was called for. On an inspection of the locality and after a perusal of the records, the Dy. Commr Mr Kuh reported that he was not in favor of granting the prayer of the Vaishyas for permission to construct the temple facing the high road, and that in the event of the Vaishyas leaving a lane

(365-09)

GPB—60,000—7 11 13

to the north of the site and facing their temple to the lane, there might may not be much objection. He pointed out that if a license is given to the Vaishyas to build the temple facing the ~~Bangalore~~ Bangalore-Mysore high road, where the procession of Swamies and deities of other Communities often pass, there would be certainly much trouble.

The papers had gone up before H H the Maharaja, and under His Highness' order, the Dy. Commr was informed that Govt were not prepared to allow the Vaishyas to Construct this temple unless they came to some agreement with the Lingayets.

The Dy Commr reported that it was impossible to effect Compromise between the Contending parties, that the Lingayets and others were very obstinate and objected to the Construction of the temple, that the Vaishyas who were very eager to Construct the temple, executed a Muchalika before him binding themselves among others to provide a lane to the north of the site as an approach from the main road

(3 Nov. VI 301-12)

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—60,000—7 11 -13

Serial No.

and to face the temple to the north in the lane instead of to the east on the high-road; and also to put up at their own cost a stone tablet inscribed with the said conditions at a conspicuous place. The papers again went up before His Highness, and under order of His Highness, permission was granted to the Vaishyas to construct the temple subject to the conditions which are enumerated in the Govt. order on the subject.

Bro. no. 2373 dt. 10-6-1913)

I

The Vaishyas have petitioned the Dy. Commr. praying for a re-consideration of the above order. While forwarding the petition and the vern. records, the present Dy. Commr. after inspection and consultation thinks that the objection to facing the temple to the road is not well-founded, and recommends that Govt. may inspect the locality and pass orders. Under cover of Sl. 2, the Dy. Commr. has forwarded the plans of the temple and site produced by the Vaishyas with their petition addressed to the Dy. Commr.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—60,000—7-11-13

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 417 of 1913.

Serial No.

The Vaishyas have presented Review-petitions to the Dewan- their main prayers are :—
(1) permission to construct the temple facing the east i.e. king's high road,
(2) permission to dispense with the putting up of a stone slab inscribing the conditions.

They seem to lay stress on the fact that this temple formerly existed facing the east, and that they prayed for permission to re-construct it- The under-Secretary Mr B. Ramaswamiah discusses at length the available evidence on the subject of the existence formerly of a temple dedicated to kanakamma, and thinks that the evidence on the point is meagre. The other grounds urged by them have been generally gone into- They have agreed to abide by the foregoing conditions in their muchalika executed before the Dy. Collector Mr Kumaraswamy Naik.

As regards the stone slab, a printed copy of G.O. No 914 Dd 6th June 1893 relating to the construction of a new masjid at Chamrajpatna is submitted- In the concluding

ages 11 & 12 of the note in Muz Dis 365-1909) R

v

^

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 417 of 1913.

Serial No.

portion of the Muzrai Superintendent Mr. Sreenivasacharlu's memo, read in extenso in the order, it is said that "But in process of time, it is possible the age of the masjid may be contested and disputes of violent character may consequently arise, leading not improbably to acts endangering public tranquility. With a view to prevent such disputes in future, a tablet was directed to be fixed-

Dewan's order on petition D.1540:—

"Let the case be examined again and the file sent up"-

Submd. for orders

NV(115)
2.3.1914 This is practically a review petition praying for a reconsideration of the Govt Order of 10 June 1913, permitting the Vaniyars to bund the temple on certain conditions which was passed after a good deal of enquiry and discussion. The subject had gone up to H H twice once during the previous Dewan's time in July 1911 and again on 22nd May 13

No new facts seem to have been adduced in the present petition. Attention is respectfully invited to the Mutchalika executed by

4
M

NOTE—Contn. on sheet.

GPB—60,000—7-11 -13

Serial No.

by some of the Vaisyas of the Closepet town by which they have clearly bound themselves to abide by the present conditions.

It is not known what the present Deputy Commr means by saying "that Govt may inspect the locality and pass orders" when it is clear that ~~the~~ it had been inspected both by ~~the~~ his ~~for~~ predecessor and the ~~the~~ then Mysore Dy Secy Mr. B. Ramaswamiah.

ans
9/3/14

T. A. B

2

Subd & 1st member

There are now three petitions on the file from the Vaisyas of Closepet: one dated 7th June 1914 ~~being~~ presented to the 5th Asst Commr Bangalore and the two others dated 10. Feb 14. and 13. Feb 1914 ~~being~~ presented to the Dewan. The last two are signed by a larger number of ~~petitioners~~ persons but all the three petitions are otherwise identical in their terms.

The history of the case and the merits of the question have been discussed at length in file no 365 of 1907. Owing to the opposition of ~~the~~ his people and in view of the opinion expressed by the 5th

T

A, B

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—60,000—7-11-13

G R. S. 12]

5 8

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 417 of 1913.

Serial No.

(Mr. B. J. Kumaraswamy Naick)

Counsel for the Govt. were not prepared to allow the Vaisyas to construct the building unless they came to some agreement with the opposing party. In his letter No 21 dated 26/29 Nov. 1912 the Sub Collr. reported that the Vaisyas would not come to any compromise and that the Vaisyas were willing to bind themselves to any reasonable conditions that might be imposed upon them. The Sub Collr. also submitted a memorandum taken respectively and signed by eight of the Vaisyas agreeing to accept certain conditions in the construction of the temple. These conditions were considered by Govt. to be strong enough and accordingly the Govt. ordered the Construction subject to these restrictions. It is this Govt. order that is now sought to be modified.

The grounds now advanced are (1) that the temple is not constructed for the first time (2) that the objection of the Vaisyas is not against the temple facing East (3) that the petitioners never pretended or intended to put-forward any claim of privileges Contrary to 'mamool' and (4) that the putting up of a stone slab maybe

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—60,000—7 11 13

Serial No.

D

dispensed with as herein too humiliating.

As regards them, the following observations may be made. Whether the temple is a new construction or not? The evidence on this point is meagre and so far as it goes, it seems to indicate that the conversion of an ordinary tiled building into a worshipping place with the images of Kanyaparameswari lodged therein and the shop found into a Bajana mane. This is clear from the extract of Mandike Patti of 1900-1 on the file. In that year the Kandayam on the tiled house used for worship and on the thatched shop used as Bajana mane stood being in the khata of Kare Bhaume Nayaka his chelty and another & was remitted. The fact that the building were in the khata of a private individual and that until 1900-1 Kandayam was being paid would appear to show that the institution was of recent origin. The new building proposed to be constructed must be considered to be a new construction in the sense that its predecessor was only an ordinary dwelling house with an ordinary shop front.

Whether the objection often being urged is against the temple fencing land?

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 417 of 1913.

Serial No.

There is nothing on the record to show that this objection originated with the Engagels. Mr. B. Ramaswamier who inspected the place locally and interviewed the parties has left on record that even this restriction has failed to satisfy the Engagels. He further points out the inconvenience often suffered by the Engagels. He suggests to leave a lane of eight feet which the temple owned pass. This is an extreme precaution but seldom required in the case of places of worship belonging to the various sects of Hindus. The processions however stand on a different footing with the local 'manuel' of 1894 showing their territorial limits in each town. In the present case the Engagels appear to object to the daily being taken out in procession with Swetachatri and the unrecognized insignia. The Magistrate executed report the Subdivl. Mr. S. H. Hastie on 14th May 1887 also shows that the dispute between the parties relate only to this matter. There seems therefore no necessity to impose this restriction ~~to the temple facing East~~.

There is not much in the argument that putting up a flat is humiliating, as this is being done every day and no

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—60,000—7-11-13

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 417 of 1919

Serial No.

humiliation is ever intended by the Govt. however on any body. Conditions 1 to 3 may be omitted but it would be satisfactory if para 3 and the date of construction may also be indicated therein.

Finally the right of the present petitioners to dispute the agreement entered into by eight of the various persons whom the Dt Commr (Mr Kumaraswamy Naick) has thus considered. One Ayyan Kone Bhavani Narasimhia chetty is the original khatedar of the house and most necessarily was a leading person among the various as he is the foremost signatory also to the licence application of 1903. It is remarkable that he has now chosen to repudiate the undertaking entered into by his before the Dt Commr. It is not clear whether any of the remaining seven persons is among the signatories to the present petitions.

F

(Paper under disposal no 2)

In his letter no 593 dated 31st July 1916 the Dt Commr Mr Chandy states that after inspection and consultation, he thinks the objection to grant the building to the Govt is unfounded and requests the Govt to dispose the

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—60,000—7-11 13

G. R. S. 12]

12

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 417 of 1913.

Serial No.

Locality and from orders. A modification of the Govt. order to this extent perhaps may be taken into consideration.

hrk
19.3.14

3 I have seen the site on which it is proposed to build the Kamiska Parameswari temple. It faces the main Road and has houses on both sides of it, The Condition that a lane should be left on this small site so as to allow the entrance to open into that lane is quite absurd. A temple erected thereon cannot be treated as if it were a common nuisance especially when it belongs to such a habitually peaceful community as Vysyas. They will have no right to interfere with processions and music passing before the temple. This being clearly understood, there cannot be the slightest harm in allowing them to build a temple facing the main Road and opening into it. Before the buildings on the

Contn. sheet.

GPB -60,000—7-11 13

Serial No.

site in question fell into decay there was or could have been no blame whatever. That these buildings were being used as places of worship and Bhajans Mane, there is ample evidence, though perhaps originally they were private dwelling houses. It must be a humiliating condition & and also quite an unnecessary one & requires that they should turn the face of the building in another direction now.

I do not see any particular necessity for putting up a stone inscription embodying the other two Conditions Viz - that the Vysyas will not claim the stoppage of music and will not carry out any processions in a manner contrary to Mamool. These conditions are always understood & exist according to general laws as they are merely a negation of special privileges. It would be sufficient if the chief men of the community sign an undertaking in writing to that effect. In fact this seems to

sheet.

GPB—60,000—7-11 -13

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 417 of 1913-14.

Serial No.

have been done already -

The last order of Govt. imposing these conditions was suggested merely because the Vysyas agreed to abide by the conditions of their own accord but such an agreement would hardly bind the non assenting members of the community when the conditions imposed are in themselves unreasonable. I would therefore suggest that the order passed be modified and that the Vysyas be given permission to build a temple on the site so as to face the street without any other conditions except that they will claim no privileges on behalf of their deity.

As the last order was passed after submission to His Highness, this also should be submitted. Please draft an order and send up it to Dewan -

16.9.14

17/9/14

21.9.14

A.V.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—60,000—7 11 -13

15

G. R S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 117 of 1913

Serial No.

Draft order is subd for approval.

RL
2.10.14 Draft: appd. Please send up a clean copy.

RL
5.10.14

Clean Typed draft subd

RL
6.10.14

4 Subd to 2nd member

A draft order is submitted in accordance with the views of the 1st member. The matter has been submitted for the orders of His Highness and as the question is an important one it may perhaps be treated as Council matter

RL
8.10.14

5 The draft P.O. is approved. This may be ~~considered at a meeting of the~~ treated as a Council matter before submission to His Highness with a submissive note

LLL
9/10

6 May this be circulated for consideration at a meeting of Council.

Drummond
10/10

Yes

22.10.14. RL

1864/11.10.14

CS cir Drummond 24/10

sheet.

GPB—60,000—7-11-13

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 417 of 191 3

Serial No.	
7	Put on file of this Gmal - 18th Nov 1914 The draft order may be approved. For a D.S.N. to R.S VIII Dwn 19/11 A draft Subs. note is put up by Mr. H. M. Secy) Dwan) Dwn 30/11
6	R. &c. Bangalore & mg Advt. No. 1327-8 dt 17-12-14 — permit the construction of Kamuka Parameswari temple by Vaisyas, aforesaid, in modification of their order No. dt 16th June 13, subject to certain stated conditions, but with liberty to have an entrance facing to the east opening on the main road Request &c. Bangalore Agl. merchants Unions executed by Vaisyas binding themselves to the terms laid down in the post order — Prefer, Vide Record

2964
30-11-14

B

Sheet.

GPB—20,000—20-1-12

GPB—1,000—19-7-13

Extract from the Proceedings of the ..... 338th ..... Meeting
of the Council of His Highness the Maharaja,
held at ..... Bangalore ..... on the ..... 18th November ..... 1914.

2. SUBJECT. - (Outside the Jehoodle).

Permission to construct a Kanika Parameswari temple at Closepet, subject to certain conditions.

[illegible] ..... .

The draft order may be approved.

Sd. M.VISVESVARAYA,
Dewan of Mysore.

"Extract"

D. M. Narasinga Rao.

Offg. Secretary to Government.

Submitted to His Highness.

The accompanying papers relate to the construction of a Kannika Parameswari temple by the Vaisyas in the Closepet town. The matter had more than once come up before His Highness for orders. In Government Order No.2373 dated 10th June 1913 the Vaisyas were permitted to construct the temple subject to certain conditions.

2. A reconsideration of this order has now been sough for by the Vaisyas on the score that the conditions are inconvenient and humiliating, and Mr. Chandy, the present Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, after personal inspection of the spot, is of opinion that the objections raised by the Lingayets against the construction of the temple are not well founded and recommends the prayer of the Vaisyas for the favourable consideration of Government

3. The site was also inspected by the First Member of Council who thinks that the conditions laid down are unnecessary and somewhat humiliating and that, in the circumstances of the case, a modification of the order is called for.

4. The accompanying draft order prepared in accordance with the suggestions of the First Member was considered in Council and the Council are of opinion that the draft may be approved. The draft order is submitted for the gracious approval of His Highness.

M. Visvesvaraya
1st Dec 1914

Record of Cases submitted for the Orders of His Highness the Maharaja.

Subject.

Permission to construct a Kannika Parameswari temple at Closepet, subject to certain conditions.

Order.

KRMS
10/12/14

Secretary
12.12.14

DIARY :- 1463



191

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To

The Secretary to the Government
General & Revenue Department

Dated 31st January 1914
Despatched 2-3-14
Received
General No. 1913
No.

Enclosure No. Part I Records

---

regarding for favourable consideration
the prayer of the Mysore Community
for the reconsideration of the
Govt order granting them
permission to trade at the Lingsugur
Bazaar subject to certain Conditions

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District
Dated, Bangalore 31 July 1914.

No. S 593 —
1 Petn & 1 case

From,

K. Chandy Esquire B.A.
Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District.

To,

K. R Sreenivasa Iyengar Esquire M.A.
Secretary to the Government of Mysore
General and Revenue Departments
Bangalore.

Sir,

Adverting to Government order No 2373/Misc 321-12-2 dated 10th January 1913, granting permission to the Vysyas of Closepet town to build the temple of Sri Kanika Parameswari at the place, subject to certain conditions, I have the honour to submit herewith the petition presented by the Vysya Community praying for the reconsideration of the said Government order and for permission to build the temple facing East. After inspection and consultation, I think that the objection to facing the temple to the Road is not well founded, and beg therefore to recommend that Government may inspect the locality and pass orders.

The connected file of Vernacular Records together with the statement of the Vysyas made before the Deputy Amildar on the 19th January 1914 is herewith submitted for reference and return.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
K. Chandy

Recommends the prayer, I have also to say that the objection raised by the Lingayats to the erection of the temple is unfounded. Hence, it is suggested that the road may be closed for the benefit of the public.

3

R 3.56 [illegible]

Mr. [illegible] ISC, B. A.
Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

The humble petition of D. Subbarayashetty & 50 others, representatives of the Vaisya Community of Closepet, Bangalore District.

Respectfully sheweth,

That, adverting to the previous petitions in the matter of objections raised by Lingayets of Closepet to the reconstruction of the Kannikaparameswari temple at Closepet, and the Government order No: 2373/ M.F. 32112-2 dated 10th June 1913, the petitioners humbly represent that the order of Govt: is based upon a misconception that the petitioners attempt to build a temple for the first time, and that the opponents really objected to the reconstruction of the temple facing East; and that the said Govt: order has unnecessarily subjected the community of Vaisyes to an unmerited humiliation, in that,

(1) they are deprived of the rights of ordinary citizens in that they are prohibited from reconstructing the temple facing East, although the old building faced East.

(2) they are deprived of the rights of every loyal subject of His Highness in that they are directed not to have any doorway facing the King's high road i.e. the Maharaja's high road.

(3) and they are also directed to put up a stone slab in a conspicuous place of the temple inscribing the said objectionable conditions both in English and Kanada.

That the temple and the Bajane Mane attached thereto are ancient institutions is clear from the records in the case; and that people of other community, as also a majority of the Lingayets, have no objection to the reconstruction of the temple is clear from the various Mahazers to be found in the records.

That the Lingayets themselves never objected to the reconstruction of the temple facing East, but that they only apprehended that the petitioners might claim privileges contrary to Mamool, is clear from their statement made by them before the Deputy Amildar of Closepet on the 22 nd December 1909.

That the petitioners never pretended to put forward any claims to privileges contrary to Mamool as Clear from the agreements and Muchalikes executed by both communities before the Sub Divisional Assistant Commissioner Mr; S. H. Vardon.

That the temple is to be one which is not only a shrine of Kannikaparameswari, but also of [illegible] and [illegible] consecrated by Brahmins such as the one consecrated by that the late [illegible] at Chennapatna.

That in these circumstances the conditions laid down by Govt: prohibiting the reconstruction of the temple facing East, and insisting on the putting up of a stone slab as if the Vaisyas are habitual violators of Law and order are, the petitioners humbly submit, hardly fair or reasonable.

The petitioners humbly pray that the Govt: may be moved to reconsider the matter, and that permission may be obtained to reconstruct the temple facing East as before, and that the putting up of the stone slab may be dispensed with, subject, of course, to the terms embodied in the Muchalikes and agreements between both Vaisyas and Lingayets communities come to before the late Sub division Officer Mr: Vardon.

7th January 1914.

Your most obedient and
humble petitioners,

[illegible]

[illegible]

1483



From 5/2 191

The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To

The Secretary to Government
Genl & Revenue Deptt

Dated 3 . 2 - 14

Despatched 4 . 2 - 14

Received

General No. L 600
No.

Enclosure No. Three

Re the Construction of
Kanikaparameswari
temple at Closepet
by the Vysyas.

GPB—50,000—26 9 12

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,

Bangalore District ,

dated Bangalore, 3rd February 1914.

From

K. Cahndy Esquire, B.A,

Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District.

To

K.R. Sreenivasa Iyengar Esquire, M.A,

Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

General and Revenue Departments.

(M U Z R O I)

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No.S.593 dated the 2nd February 1914, regarding the construction of the Kannikaparameswari temple at Closepet, I have the honor to submit herewith the palns of the proposed temple and the site, produced by the Vysyas of Closepet with their petition herein enclosed, and to solicit early orders in the matter.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obeddient servant,

K Chandy

Deputy Commissioner.

Bangalore, 3rd Feb'14

6

To

K. Chandy Esqre B.A.

Dy. Commissioner

Bangalore

The humble petition of Sri Narayanah & Narasappa sons of the representatives of the Vysya Community of Closepet.

Respectfully sheweth

That in reference to the petition of January last in the matter of the reconstruction of the Kanneka-paramesvari temple in Closepet, the enclosed are a sketch of the tower in reference to the temple, & a plan of the proposed reconstruction of the temple.

That the petitioners have already spent about Rs. 5000/- on the materials required for the building, & are prepared to

Spend

and Rs 10,000 Rs to complete
the building.

your humble & obedient
Servants.

Bangalore
3rd Feb 1864

To, VII

The Dewan's orders.
Let the case be examined afresh and the full particulars
Sd/- 14/2

"R" No. 1540

1913 1914
Sri Sri
No. 417-13
30-4

M. Visvesvaraya, Esq, M.I.C.E., C.I.E.,

Dewan of Mysore,

BANGALORE.

The humble petition of Dowlath Subbarrya Setty and other representatives of the Vysya Community of Closepet, Bangalore District,

Respectfully Showeth:

That the Government order No.2375/M.F.32112-2, dated 10th June 1913 in the matter of objections raised by Lingayats of Closepet to the reconstruction of the Kannika Parameswari Temple at Closepet is based upon a misconception that the petitioners attempt to build a temple for the first time, and that the opponents really objected to the reconstructing of the Temple facing East and that the said order has unnecessarily subjected the Vysyas to an unmerited humiliation, in that

1. they are deprived of the rights of ordinary citizens by prohibiting the reconstruction of the temple facing East, although the old building faced East;
2. they are deprived of the rights of every loyal subject of His Highness the Maharaja in that they are directed not to have any door-way facing the King's high road, i.e, Maharaja's high road;
3. and they are also directed to put up a stone slab in a conspicuous place of the temple inscribing the said abject conditions both in English and Kanada.

That the Temple and the Bhajane Mane attached thereto are ancient institutions is clear from the records of the case and that people of other communities as also a majority of Lingayats, have no objection to the reconstruction of the temple is clear from the various Mahazirs to be found in the records of the case.

That the Lingayats themselves never objected to the reconstruction of the Temple facing East but that they only apprehended that the petitioners might claim privileges contrary to Mamool is clear from the statement made by them before the Deputy Amildar of Closepet on the 22nd December 1909.

That the petitioners never pretended or intended to put forward any claims to privileges contrary to mamool is clear from the agreements and Mutchalikas executed by both Communities before the Sub Divisional Assistant Commissioner Mr. S.H. Vardon.

That the temple is to be not only a shrine of Kannika Parameswari but also of ಈಶ್ವರ, ಪಾರ್ವತಿ, ಗಣಪತಿ, ಉಪವೀಶ್ವರ, ಚಂಡಿಕೇಶ್ವರ, ವಿಷ್ಣು, ಹಿಂಬುನೇಯ, and ನವಗ್ರಹ consecrated by duly qualified brahmins, such as the one consecrated by the late Sringeri Swamy at Chennapatna, and also a free boarding house for poor Brahmin students and a boarding house for poor Vysya students. That in these circumstances the conditions laid down by Government prohibiting the reconstructing of the Temple facing East, as if the temple is unworthy of being permitted to face the Maharaja's high Road and insisting on the putting up of a stone slab with the said conditions inscribed thereon, as if the Vysyas, who have always been peaceful and loyal are at this place habitual violators of law and order, are, the petitioners humbly submit, most painful to the feelings of the Community and hardly fair or reasonable.

10

The petitioners humbly pray therefore, that the Government may be pleased to ascertain the views of the Deputy Commissioner Mr. K.Chandy who has seen the proposed building and made local enquiries, and reconsider their order and grant permission to the reconstruction of the temple facing East, and dispense with the putting up of a stone slab inscribing what they feel to be most humiliating conditions - subject ofcourse to the terms embodied in the Mutchalikas and agreements between both Vysya and Lingayat communities come to before the late Sub-Divisional Officer Mr. S.H. Verdon, or subject to any terms or restrictions which the Government may be pleased to consider reasonable to impose.

Yours most obedient servants,

Bangalore.
13. 2. 1914

K. Kothandramachetty.

11

Abject Conditions referred to in the Appeal Memorandum.

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, dated Bangalore10th June 1913.

No.2373/Mus.321-12-2.

xxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxx xxx.xxxxxxx

(1) A lane of 8 feet wide should be provided towards the north of the site as an approach from the main road, and the Temple should face the North and open into this lane;

(2) No door-way should be opened on the main road;

(3) The privilege of stoppage of music on any occasion near the Temple when porcessions of any other classes of people pass through the High Road should not be claimed by the Vysyas;

(4) No processions should be carried out by the Vysyas, except in strict accord with Mamul.

(5) A stone slab inscribed with the purport of these conditions in English and Kanada should be put up at the cost of the Vysyas in a conspicuous place that may be pointed out by the Deputy Commissioner.

9. The Deputy Commissioner should see that the same stone slab referred to above is securely and conspicuously placed on the Temple wall facing the main road.

Sd. K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar,
Secretary to Government.

Application for Revision 12

M. Visvesvaraya, Esq., M.I.C.E., C.I.E.,

Dewan of Mysore, & the Councillors to the Govt. of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore
PANGALORE.

Thro' the Secretary, Mysore Govt.

1910

Presented by Mr. C.S. Napalrushana Rao VII

The humble petition of Dowlath Subbaraya Shetty and others representatives of the Vysya Community of Closepet, Bangalore District,

Respectfully Showeth:-

That the Government Order No. 2373/M.F. 32112-2, dated 10th June 1913 in the matter of objections raised by Lyngayats of Closepet to the reconstruction of the Kannika Parameswari Temple at Closepet is based upon a misconception that the petitioners attempt to build a temple for the first time, and that the opponents really objected to the reconstruction of the Temple facing East; and that the said Order has unnecessarily subjected the community of Vysyas to an unmerited humiliation, in that

(1) they are deprived of the rights of ordinary citizens by prohibiting the reconstruction of the Temple facing East, although the old building faced East;

(2) they are deprived of the rights of every loyal subject of His Highness the Maharaja in that they are directed not to have

have any door-way facing the King's high road, i.e, Maharaja's high road;

(3) and they are also directed to put up a stone slab in a conspicuous place of the Temple inscribing the said abject - conditions both in English and Kanada.

That the Temple and the Bhajane-Manai attached thereto are ancient Institutions is clear from the records of the case; and that people of other communites as also a majority of Lyngayats, have no objection to the reconstruction of the temple is clear from the various Mahazirs to be found in the records of the case.

That the Lyngayats themselves never objected to the reconstruction of the Temple facing East, but that they only apprehended that the petitioners might claim privileges contrary to Mamool is clear from the statement made by them before the Deputy Amildar of Closepet on the 22nd December,1909.

That the petitioners never pretended or intended to put forward any claims to privileges contrary to - Mamool is clear from the agreements and Mutchalikas - executed by both Communities before the Sub Divisional Assistant Commissioner Mr. S.H. Vardon.

That the Temple is to be not only a Shrine of Kannika Parameswari but also of ಈಶ್ವರ,ಪಾರ್ವತಿ,ಗಣಪತಿ, ಬಸವೇಶ್ವರ,ಚಂದಿಕೇಶ್ವರ,ವಿಷ್ಣು, ಆಂಜನೇಯ ಮತ್ತು ನವಗ್ರಹ consecrated by duly qualified Brahmins, such as the one conscrated by the late Sringeri Swamy at Chennapatna and also a Free-Boarding House for poor Brahmin Students and a Boarding House for poor Vysya students. That in

14

in these circumstances the conditions laid down by Government prohibiting the reconstruction of the Temple facing East, as if the Temple is unworthy of being permitted to face the Maharaja's high road, and insisting on the putting up of a stone slab with the said conditions inscribed thereon, as if the Vysyas, who have always been peaceful and loyal, are at this place habitual voilators of Law and Order, are, the petitioners hubly submit, most painful to the feelings of the Community and hardly fair or reasonable.

The petitioners humbly pray, therefore, that the Government may be pleased to ascertain the views of the Deputy Commissioner Mr. K. Chandy who has seen the proposed building and made local enquiries, and reconsider their order and grant permission to the reconstruction of the Temple Facing East, and dispense with the putting up of a stone slab inscribing what they feel to be most humiliating conditions - Subject of course to the terms embodied in the Mutchalikas and agreements between both Vysya and Lingayat communities come to before the late Sub Divisional Officer Mr. S.H. Vardon, or subject to any terms or restrictions which the Government may be pleased to consider reasonable to impose.

Your most obedient servants,

Bangalore.

1914.

Chetty

భూమిశిస్తు వసూళ్ళ నాయుడు గారికి

వెంకటగిరి సంస్థానము

B. Venkatachalapati Chetty.

for Venkatachalam Chetty





Before the Government of Mysore
ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

19 13 —19 14 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ Mrs. ಸಂಬರು.

ವಾದಿ. Petrs. ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ.

K. Gundu Narasimiah
B. Venkatanarasiah
Lawyers

Advocates C.B. Seshagiri Rao & Nagabhushana Rao Advocates
Petrs. ಬರಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ತುನಾಮ.

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ನಂಬರ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ವಿವಾದಿಸಿ ಫೈಸಲ್ ಹೊಂದತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೂ, ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲೂ, ಅರ್ಜಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ನನಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲತಕ್ಕ ಡಿಕ್ರೀ ಮೊಬಲಗು ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು ಸಹ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ರಶೀದಿ ಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ನನಿಗಾಗಿ ವಾಪಸುಆಗುವ ದಾವಾ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪು ಪ್ರೋಸೆಸ್‌ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪು ಸಹ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಮತ್ತು ನನ್ನ ಬಾಬತು ವಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ದಸ್ತೈತ ವಜಾ ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ, ಸಹ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ತಮಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನಡಿಸುವ ಕೆಲಸಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿ ಇರುವಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಲೂ ಇದರಿಂದ ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇಧ್ದೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು 10.2.14 ರುಜು [illegible]

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತಾರ್‌ನಾಮ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಿಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಇವಕ್ಕೆ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುವದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಸರ್ಟಿಫೈ ಮಾಡಿ ಇಧ್ದೇನೆ. C.B. Seshagiri Rao

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತಾರ್‌ನಾಮಾ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿಧ್ದೇನೆ. C.B. Seshagiri Rao
C.B. Nagabhushana Rao, Advocate

ಈ ಪೋರಂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಶಿಟಿ ಬಿಕ್.ಪೇಟೆ ಪ್ಲಾಂಪ್ ಪೆಂಡರ್ ಯಂ. ನಂಜುಂಡಪ್ಪನವರ್ಲಿ ಜೊಕೆಯುಕ್ತ.

To

M. Visvesvaraiah Esqre C.I.E
Dewan of Mysore.

DIARY No. 1790.
19/3-19/4
SECTION Secret
FILE NO. 417-13
SERIAL No. 4A

The humble petition of
the Subbaraya sekhyakers
representatives of Vysya
community of Closepet

Respectfully sheweth,

That in reference
to the application for Reward
now pending before Govt in the
matter of reconstruction of the
Kannikaparamesmari temple
in Closepet, the accompanying
Mahazar since obtained by
them, coupled with the absence
of anything to the contrary in the entire
records of the case, shews beyond
all doubt that the old temple
faced east i.e. the main Road
Bangalore - Mysore road.

Your most obedt. & humble
servants

21 2 14.





To,

The General and Revenue Secretary

to the Government of His Highness the

Maharaja of Mysore, B A N G A L O R E.

Dasada Yejman Naranappa,
Shetty Yadurappa,
Murudappa,
Gurushanthappa & others
who have signed below. ..... Petitioners.

In the matter of a license to build

Kanyaka Parameshwari Temple at Closepet:

That the petitioners abovenamed beg to state as follows:-

1. That the undersigned petitioners all belong to Deshadapet and there are more than 2,000 houses belonging to Deshada Komavar. That the Komatis do not belong to Deshada Komavar and there are hardly 25 houses at Closepet belonging to that Community.

2. That the Komatis have been attempting to build the temple of Kanyaka Parameshwari in the heart of Deshada Doddapet with a view to spite Deshada people and wound their religious feelings, thereby causing disturbance to public peace.

Kanyaka Parameshwari is no Goddess belonging to Hindu Pantheon and is not worshipped by any community except Komatis.

3. That the Government were pleased to order in No.178/Muz.365-09-12 dated 12th July 1911 that the Komatis and the petitioners may settle their dispute among themselves and then apply to Government for license to build. Later on Government without giving any further opportunity to be heard passed proceedings in No.2,373/Muz.321-12-2 - dated Bangalore, 10th June,1913, imposing certain conditions upon the Komatis to build their Temple.

4. That though the petitioners had their own grievances against the last order of the Government yet they kept quiet as it was finally settled; but now the petitioners - learn that some of the Komatis have been attempting to get - some of the restrictions removed in the final orders of Government although the leading men of their Community have all - agreed to the terms of Muchchalika to abide by the conditions stated in the said Government Proceedings.

5 That the petitioners humbly pray that though the - final proceedings of the Government passed is already very favourable to Komatis causing inconvenience and disturbance to the petitioners, yet the attempt on the part of the Komatis in trying to set aside the said proceedings will work great - hardship and tend to promote unnecessary ill-will and disturbance to public peace.

6. That the Komatis have been misrepresenting facts as

if

if Lingayets alone are the contesting parties. On the other hand the whole town comprising several - communities are opposed to the attempt on the part of the Komatis to build their Temple.

The petitioners therefore humbly pray that the Komatis may either be allowed to build their temple as per conditions contained in No.2,373/Muz.321-12-2 dated Bangalore, 10th June,1913 or be not allowed to build the said Temple in the streets belonging to - Deshadapet people.

BANGALORE,
28th March,14.







General and Revenue Secretary
to the Govt of H H the Maharaja of
Mysore, Bangalore

ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

191 — ನಂಬರು.

ವಾದಿ. Petitioners

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ.

Y. Narayappa & others	VS.	

ಮ|| ರಾ||. H.K. Veerabasavaiah, B.A., B.L., Advocate ಯವರಿಗೆ

Petitioners ಬರೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮಾ.

ಈ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಆಪೈರುವರಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏವಾದ ಜರಗಿಸಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ನನ್ನ ಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲುನೂಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು ಸಹಾ ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗಾಗಿ ರೀಫಂಡ್ ಆಗತಕ್ಕ ಸ್ಟಾಂಪನ್ನು ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸುಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ಯಾವ ಲಾಯದಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೊ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕ್ಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ೫ಧೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು

ರುಜು.

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯ ಸ್ವರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿದೇನೆ.

H Veerabasavaiah
Adv

ಈ ಫಾರಂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ ೩೬೬ನೆ ನಂಬರು ಷಾಪ್‌ಕೀಪರ್ (ಎಚ್. ಬಿ. ಚೆಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಾ ಶೆಟ್ಟರವರ್ಲ್ಲಿ) ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತ.

ha , Bangalore City.

G.R.S. 28]

File No. 41/13

Serial No. 6

*Diary No. of letter replied to*_____

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

( )

, *the* 191 .

te of issue 17-12-1914

ned by T G Aravamudachar

READ—

Government Proceedings No.2373/ M.F.301-12-2 dated the 10th June 1913 permitting the reconstruction of the Kannika Parameswari temple at Closepet

~~ORDER THEREON.—No~~

subject to certain conditions.

Petition dated the 10th February 1914 from Dowlath Subraya Setty and other representatives of the Vaisya community of Closepet praying for a

over.

SUBJECT.

Cwl 15/12

review of the order read above.

Petition dated the 28th March 1914 received from Desada Yajaman Naranappa, Setty Yadurappa and other lingayets of Closepet praying that the Vaisyas should build the temple under the conditions laid down by Government in the order read above or should not be permitted to construct it at all.

Correspondence ending with letter from the Dy Comm^r, Bangalore dt. No.600 dated the 3rd February 1914 submitting for the orders of Government the petition from the Vaisyas praying for a reconsideration of the Government order and stating that after personal inspection and consultation he is of opinion that the objection raised to the temple facing the main road on the east is not well founded.

Order thereon: No. 1327-8 Emi/Jud Dy 17-12-1914
Dmis 417-13-6

---

the order read above, the con-

Parameswari temple

GPB—20,000—2 10 11

1914-15

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 17th December 1914

No. 1327-8
Muz. 417-13-6

Passing orders regarding the reconstruction of the Kannika Parameswari Temple at Closepet, in modification of Government Order No. 2373—Muz. 301-12-2, dated 10th June 1913.

GPB—30 12-14-200

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

at Closepet was permitted subject to the following conditions:--

(1) A lane 8 feet wide should be provided towards the north of the site as an approach from the main road; and the temple should face the north and open into this lane.

(2) No doorway should be opened on the main road.

(3) The privilege of stoppage of music on any occasion near the temple when processions of any other classes of people pass through the high road should not be claimed by the Vaisyas.

(4) No processions should be carried out by the Vaisyas except in strict accord with mamul.

(5) A stone slab inscribed with the purport of these conditions in English and Kannada should be put up at the cost of the Vaisyas in a conspicuous place that may

GPB—10,000—22-2-11

be pointed out by the Deputy Commissioner.

2. The Vaisyas now pray for a reconsideration of this order on the grounds that

(i) the temple is not a new institution and that the old buildings which are now proposed to be reconstructed actually faced East;

(ii) the objection of the Lingayets is not against the temple facing East;

(iii) that the Vaisyas do not intend to put forward any claim to privileges contrary to mamul;

(iv) and that the putting up of a stone slab proclaiming the conditions is humiliating to the community.

3. On the other hand, the Lingayets contend that though the order read above has permitted the Vaisyas to build the temple Desadapet in which there are more than houses belonging to the Lingayets are hardly 25 houses

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

of the Vaisyas, the latter are agitating for a reconsideration of the order with a view to hurt their religious feelings leeding to a disturbance of the public peace, and pray that if the Vaisyas are not willing to build their temple under the conditions imposed in the order of Government, they may not be allowed to ~~xxix~~ build it at all in the streets of the Desadapet people.

4. The Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, in submitting for the orders of Government, the petition of the Vaisyas praying for a reconsideration of the order, states that after personal inspection of the site he is of opinion that the objection to face the temple to the East is unfounded.

5. Government observe that the site on which it is proposed to build the Kannika Parmesvari Temple faces the main road on the East and has houses on both sides of it, and that before the buildings on it fell into decay there was or could have

GPB—10,000—22-2-11

been no lane whatever. There is further ample evidence that these buildings were being used as places of worship and"Bhajane Mane" though perhaps originally they were private dwelling houses.

6. Government therefore consider that conditions Nos.1 and 2 regarding a lane to be provided to the North of the site so that the temple may open into it, and prohibiting the opening of a door way to the East on the main road, are unnecessary and somewhat humiliating. In the case especially of a habitually peaceful community like the Vaisyas, Government see no harm in allowing the temple to face the main road and open into it.

7. Conditions Nos.3 and 4 prohibiting the Vaisyas from claiming the stoppage of music and from carrying on processions in a manner contrary to mamul, are always understood to exist to general law as they are

G. R. S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

9, 2

merely a negation of special privileges; and as the chief men of the community ~~xx~~ have given an undertaking in writing to ~~xhx~~ that effect, Government ~~C~~onsider that assurance sufficient, and are accordingly pleased to direct that there is no necessity for a stone inscription being put up on the temple embodying these two conditions.

8. Government are accordingly pleased to modify thdir order of the 10th June 1913 and to grant the Vaisyas permission to build their temple on the site in question with full liberty to ~~place a~~ have an entrance facing to the East and ~~an~~ dor opening on the main road. It should be clearly understood that the Vaisya community will have no ~~r~~ight to interfere with processions and music passing before the temple and that they should at no time claim any privileges contrary to mamul on behalf of their ~~duty~~ deity. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to have a proper muchalika executed by all the

GPB—12,000—15-2-13.

leading men of the community binding themselves to these terms.

For Offg. Secretary to Government.

To

The Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, returning Vernacular records.

The Muzrai Superintendent in Mysore.